DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 360 EA 023 948

AUTHOR Chester, Mitchell D.; Pecheone, Raymond L.
TITLE Proposal for an Outcome-Based School Administrator License.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Certification; *Change Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Licensing Examinations (Professions); *Principals
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut; *Performance Based Certification

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a framework for licensing school principals in Connecticut. The proposal contains three elements that depart substantially from other reform initiatives: preservice preparation focusing on mastery and application of a teaching and learning knowledge base, study of educational administration during the beginning years of administrative service, and performance-based licensure. The paper begins by explaining the context for revising principal preparation and licensure and reviewing the literature supporting Connecticut's reform strategy. Five postulates to advance the revision of preparation and licensing are presented: (1) the purpose of schools is to ensure the growth and achievement of all students; (2) teachers and principals must collaborate to ensure all students' achievement; (3) principals' preservice education must be restructured to focus on teaching, learning, curriculum, and instruction; (4) professional socialization into educational administration should occur during the inservice preparation phase; and (5) the value of performance-based licensure is its ability to target preparation and practice areas linked to student learning. The implementation of Connecticut's proposal is then explicated by following "Charlene Jones," a hypothetical candidate from preservice through professional certification. (41 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345360

PROPOSAL FOR AN OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR LICENSE[1]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Chester

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mitchell D. Chester
Raymond L. Pecheone[2]

Connecticut State Department of Education

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, California
April 1992

EA 023 948

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The purpose of this paper is to present a framework for licensing school principals in Connecticut. Our proposal contains three elements that depart substantially from other initiatives to reform preparation and licensure: (1) Preservice preparation of principals will focus on the knowledge base for teaching and learning, and the application of this knowledge. As currently conceived, it is possible for a candidate to qualify for initial certification without taking formal coursework in educational administration. (2) Study of educational administration will occur during the beginning years of administrative service. (3) Licensure will be performance based. Candidates for initial certification will need to demonstrate their knowledge of teaching and learning and their application of that knowledge, and their ability to evaluate and supervise teaching. Prior to professional certification, principals will be required to show that they fostered a school culture that focused on teaching and learning and where all students achieved.

We begin the paper with a brief overview of the context for the revision of principal preparation and licensure, followed by a review of the literature that supports Connecticut's reform strategy. We present five postulates we believe will advance the revision of preparation and licensure. The implementation of Connecticut's proposal is then explicated by following a hypothetical candidate from preservice through professional certification.

THE CONTEXT FOR THE REFORM OF PREPARATION AND LICENSURE

Clarion calls for educational reform have resounded since the early 1980s. As a result, states and districts have introduced new initiatives and mandates designed to improve the quality of schooling. Initiatives have addressed a range of educational inputs, such as finance reform, school governance structures, and workplace

conditions. Other reforms addressed the measurement of performance, most often the performance of students, and frequently that of teachers.

Only recently have reform efforts begun to address school principals. Duke (in press) identifies five major calls for reform in the preparation of principals since the mid-1980s (the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, the Danforth Foundation, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, the Southern Regional Consortium of Colleges of Education, and the National Commission for the Principalship). Peters (1988) notes that many states have enacted legislation requiring formal evaluation of principals only since 1987. Several states have revised their licensure requirements, although few have made comprehensive changes in the way that principals are prepared or licensed.[3]

In Connecticut during the mid-1980s, a number of initiatives designed to influence the status and quality of the teaching profession were implemented that have raised the standards of professional competence for prospective and beginning teachers, focused the attention of educators on issues of teaching and learning, and substantially increased the compensation for teachers and administrators. In addition, a 1990 legislative mandate has established district and school report cards that will make public indicators of student achievement and engagement, teacher and student demographic data, and the commitment of fiscal and human resources.

Having addressed teacher standards, student assessment, and indicators of school outcomes, Connecticut is now turning its attention to school administrators. A task force composed of administrators, teachers, and representatives of higher education, business and industry, and local boards of education was appointed by the State Board of Education to make recommendations regarding the recruitment, preparation, selection, induction, licensure, and professional development of administrators. The highlights of the task force's recommendations include strengthening preparation programs and shifting the basis of licensure from the

existing requirements of graduate credits and teaching experience to an outcome-based system in which critical knowledge, skills, and abilities are demonstrated.

FOUNDATIONS OF THE CONNECTICUT REFORM

As we examine the literature, we discover competing understandings of principal effectiveness and school leadership. Collectively these understandings reveal a range of conceptualizations of the principal, but lack a coherent notion of effectiveness. Consider, for example, the following understandings of the principalship, each of which provides a different perspective of effective administration.

Effective principals utilize "symbolic" leadership, shaping the elements of the school culture by communicating in both straightforward and subtle ways, using critical incidents to reaffirm or redirect the values and beliefs of the school, and helping the school adapt to change in traditions and norms (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Deal & Peterson, 1990). Effective principals exercise "transformational" leadership, facilitating the emergence of leadership within the school faculty and thus empowering teachers to engage in the decision-making and inquiry that is necessary to ensure a vital, productive educational environment (Barth, 1986, 1990; National LEADership Network Study Group on Restructuring Schools, 1991). Effective principals are problem solvers and decision makers who are skilled "artists" of administration (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Leithwood & Stager, 1989; Schon, 1983). Effective principals are adept at generic administrative competencies associated with both educational and non-educational fields, such as problem analysis, conflict management, stress tolerance, leadership, and decisiveness (The Maryland LEAD Center, 1988; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1986; Texas LEAD Center, 1988)

While it is important that we do not trivialize the complexity of the principals' role, this breadth of perspectives fails to suggest a compelling focus for principal preparation. When preparation programs attempt to encompass the range of

understandings of principal effectiveness, they lack coherence (Forsyth, 1992), resembling instead "a patchwork of courses" (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1989).

Connecticut's attempt to reconcile these diverse views of principal effectiveness has lead to a restructuring of preservice, inservice, and licensure requirements. Our model is built on the research base regarding principal socialization and student performance.

Preservice Education: Focus on Teaching and Learning

Our framework for licensure concentrates during the preservice phase on candidates' understanding of teaching and learning and the application of that knowledge. We believe that an understanding of teaching, learning, curriculum, and instruction is most critical for initial success on the job. This focus stems from the research on principal behavior in instructionally effective schools as well as from the wisdom of practitioners, who report that the content of preservice programs in educational administration has limited influence on the novice principal (Barth, 1990; Duke, in press).

Prospective principals need a thorough grounding in teaching, learning, curriculum, and instruction. We know, for example, that principals in instructionally effective schools emphasize achievement by setting goals and developing student performance standards, are actively involved in decision making regarding curriculum and instruction, and leverage support and resources for improvement of curriculum and instruction. In addition, these principals devote time to coordination of instruction, including classroom observations, teacher and program evaluation, and promotion of professional development opportunities (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990) validated a causal model that linked instructional leadership and school achievement. They found that principals influence

school and student achievement by attending to school governance, instructional organization, and school climate. Effective principals involve teachers in instructional decision making while protecting the staff from external pressures and influence. They pay considerable attention to developing school goals, help teachers acquire instructional resources, supervise teaching through direct observation and the provision of feedback, encourage classroom monitoring of student progress, and evaluate curricular programs. And effective principals create high expectations for academic achievement and social behavior, "orient[ing] the school program to sets of goals widely endorsed by the community and school district and report[ing] the degree of achievement of these goals" (p. 119).

We cannot assume that prospective principals have achieved an understanding of teaching and learning during their teacher (Goodlad, 1990; Kennedy, 1991) or principal preparation (Murphy & Hallinger, 1989) programs. To focus preservice preparation, candidates for initial certification will have to successfully complete an examination of their understanding of teaching and learning and their application of that knowledge, and a simulated performance exercise that assesses their ability to evaluate and supervise teaching.

Inservice Education: Focus on Professional Socialization

Formal study of educational administration will occur during the beginning years of administrative service. We recognize that an understanding of teaching and learning is a necessary, but insufficient, requirement to ensure that candidates' for licensure are effective principals. Understanding of educational administration is needed, and it is to the placement of this study that we now turn.

When examining adult socialization, the distinction between organizational and professional socialization is drawn. Professional socialization is concerned with broad awareness and understanding; with imparting the knowledge needed to become a member of a profession (Bullough, R.V., Jr., Knowles, J.G., & Crow, N.A., 1989; Duke,

1988). In contrast, organizational socialization is the process by which an individual learns the knowledge, skills, and values needed to fulfill a role within a particular organization.

When we talk to practicing administrators about the sources of their administrative expertise, they often highlight the distinction between what they learned in their educational administration program (professional socialization) and what they learned on the job (organizational socialization). The insight of practitioners suggests that those understandings and skills that are most important to surviving in the first year or two on the job -- the culture and norms of the district; local policies and regulations; and practical skills needed to run the building -- are not those that higher education is best prepared to teach. During their first days and months on the job, principals are most concerned about relations with peers and the community, relations with peers and superiors, and learning standard building and district operating procedure (Duke, 1987).

In fact, there is evidence that the influence of the formal educational administration preparation program is obviated during the induction experience. As Hart (1991) notes, where the values and norms instilled during the induction into an organization differ substantially from those acquired during professional preparation, "organizational socialization quickly overpowers professional socialization. ... The salience, immediacy, and power of the work context hold sway over education and training" (p. 452).

Duke suggests that what university faculty are best able to provide, "insights, understandings, and knowledge derived from research and theory, ... is likely to be of greatest value to experienced administrators with a desire to make sense of their experience and improve on it." A major advantage of locating the educational administration program during inservice education is the potential to integrate theory

(organizational theory and behavior, leadership) with the practical experience of the principals.

Duke (in press) suggests that reform efforts should consider greater local control in the initial stage of principal certification and increased university involvement in the inservice education of principals. The inservice preparation program should develop an awareness of what school leaders do and of how practice varies across settings. In addition, the professional program should include a liberal arts component to ensure that school administrators understand the purposes and effects of education within cultural, social, economic, and political contexts (Duke, 1988).

Performance-Based Licensure

Typically, the certification of administrators is tied to teaching experience and preparation for educational administration at an institution of higher education. Preparation often consists of a series of distinct courses rather than a coherent plan of study, taught to part-time students who cannot afford to sacrifice a year's salary to attend graduate school full-time, without the benefit of a substantial internship or field experience (Duke, in press; Forsyth, 1992; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1989).

We propose to tie licensure to performance. Candidates for initial certification will be required to demonstrate their understanding of teaching and learning and their application of that knowledge, and their ability to evaluate and supervise teaching. Prior to professional certification, principals will have to document that they fostered a school culture where adults focused on teaching and learning and where all students achieved.

Performance assessment involves the observation of candidates during the performance of, or in a situation that simulates, tasks considered critical to the effective execution of a job. By observing candidates perform critical job tasks and confront unstructured problem situations, assessors can evaluate performance along

dimensions considered essential for principals. Likewise, by engaging experienced administrators in interviews about school-site documentation focusing on student learning, assessors can evaluate principals' effectiveness in relation to student performance that goes beyond standardized test results.

Several reports have called for performance-based licensing and increased standards for licensure (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985; National Governors' Association, 1990; National Commission for the Principalship, 1990; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1989). The history of performance assessment for the selection and promotion of administrators in public and private sector employment and its recent applications to the field of education demonstrate the viability of this methodology for principal licensure. Performance assessment exercises have been utilized by government agencies and the private sector in the United States and in Europe since pre-World War II years (Thorton & Byham, 1982).

More recently, performance assessment methodology has been adapted to education. At the higher education level, assessment centers have been used at Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to establish the educational competence of undergraduate students, and in various medical schools to evaluate the clinical competence of medical students (Byham, 1989). Elementary and secondary student performance exercises have been or are being instituted at the district, state, and local level (Mitchell, 1991). The development of multiple assessment exercises to certify accomplished teaching practice is currently in progress at the national level (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1990). In addition, several states use or are investigating performance assessment measures to verify the performance of candidates for teacher licensure.[4] The National Association of Secondary School Principals has developed an assessment center for principals that has been used for licensure, selection, and professional development (Hersey, 1989).[5]

FIVE POSTULATES FOR PREPARATION AND LICENSURE

We have identified five postulates to guide the development of Connecticut's framework and advance the reform of principal preparation and licensure. By building from these suppositions, the continuum from preservice preparation through professional licensure is likely to provide a coherent program of socialization and professional development that is articulated around the core technical knowledge of schools -- teaching and learning.

Postulate 1. **The purpose of schools is to ensure the growth and achievement of all students.** Earlier we alluded to the cacophony of voices that define principal effectiveness. This first postulate is essential to focusing the discussion about the role of the principal. Having stated this belief, we can proceed to a discussion of principal effectiveness.

Murphy and Hallinger (1989) report that "[i]nvestigations of the principalship at both the secondary and elementary levels ... find that instructional leadership is generally conspicuous by its absence. As [they] have reported elsewhere:

> Taken together, these studies present a picture of administrators whose time is heavily devoted to matters other than curriculum and instruction, to issues of student discipline, parent relations, plant operations and school finance. Most principals do not formally supervise and evaluate teachers, plan and co-ordinate curriculum, actively monitor the technology of the school or progress of students, or spend much time in classrooms. In short, most principals do not act as instructional leaders. Rather, in most districts and schools, curriculum and instruction are managed by default." (p. 26)

The relationship between the principal and school academic achievement can be understood by examining activities the principal undertakes to influence school culture and school instructional organization. Heck and Marcoulides (1990) found that the "principal's role in establishing strong instructional organization of the school's core technology is a domain that is highly predictive of building strong climate and

school student achievement" (p. 259). Effective principals "develop school goals that are consistent with district curriculum and policies, they utilize test results to implement program changes, they ensure that the staff utilizes frequent monitoring of student progress, they discuss how instruction impacts student achievement, and they take an active role in observing and evaluating curricular programs ... [These principals] communicat[e] instructional goals to staff and community, establish high expectations for performance, establish an orderly, positive learning environment with a clear discipline code, and communicat[e] academic achievement results to the community" (pgs. 259-260).

Principals who successfully facilitate the academic achievement of students insist on a clear, present academic focus (Teddlie, Kirby, & Stringfield, 1989); are aware of areas of faculty weakness through frequent, personal monitoring of classrooms (Heck & Marcoulides, 1990; Teddlie, Kirby, & Stringfield, 1989; Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oesher, 1991); provide assistance for those teachers who need help (Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oesher, 1991); and carefully allocate and protect instructional time through setting time allocation in all classes, coordinating time usage, allocating large blocks of times for reading and math instruction, and reducing interruptions (Murphy, 1989). Leithwood and Stager (1989), in their study of novice and expert principals' problem solving, determined that unlike novice principals, when experts encountered unstructured problems, their interpretations "tended to include consequences for the school and for the academic growth of large numbers of students" (p. 140).

Postulate 2. **The adults in the school must collaborate in their pursuit of achievement for all students.** In contrast to the asymmetry of authority between principals and teachers that characterize many discussions of administration, we endorse a perspective on organizational culture that stresses a moderation of the power imbalance. Principals must facilitate teachers' efforts to pursue practices and carry out activities that will promote the achievement of all students. Principals must

be able and willing to share with, and encourage leadership from, their faculty in an effort to encourage teachers to embrace strategies that strengthen their students' performance. Leaders must establish an organizational norm that values inquiry and risk-taking. However, sharing leadership and encouraging experimentation are not ends unto themselves. These activities must be in the service of improved student performance and school outcomes.

Principals and faculty must be committed to their professional development, particularly as this development relates to the school program and student achievement. Principals should be engaged in inquiry into teaching and learning, thus setting an expectation through their example that teachers will be engaged in learning about teaching. By establishing communities of learners and leaders, a culture is created where "there is an expectation -- even a demand -- that everyone on the faculty can and must make a difference in the overall life of the school" (Barth, 1990, p. xi).

Postulate 3. **Preservice education of principals must be restructured to focus on teaching, learning, curriculum, and instruction.** Prospective principals need a thorough understanding of pedagogy and pedagogical content knowledge. We cannot assume that teacher preparation programs have provided this knowledge (Goodlad, 1990; Kennedy, 1991). An understanding of developmental psychology and learning theories is essential. Principals need to be skilled at conducting classroom observations, evaluating teaching, and supporting teacher improvement. Additionally, principal candidates should be able to apply a variety of student assessment methods to monitor individual student, program, and school progress, and must possess strategies for revising curriculum and programs in the service of student performance.

We are not alone in advocating this preservice focus for school principals. Forsyth (1992) formulates three assertions to guide administrator preparation:

1. The core technology of education is teaching/learning.
2. The primary role of the school administrator is problem finding and intervention with respect to teaching/learning.
3. The purpose of preservice education of school administrators is to foster and assure knowledge and skill related to the improvement of teaching and learning (p. 24).

Murphy and Hallinger (1989) attribute the general absence of instructional leadership to a "lack of knowledge on the part of administrators about how to manage technical core operations" (p. 26). They cite several studies that document a paucity of content in most preservice programs of educational administration that is directly related to supervision, curriculum, or instruction. One researcher reported that only eleven per cent of the total required coursework included the areas of supervision, instruction, and curriculum. Murphy and Hallinger conclude that, "given our expanding understanding of curricular and instructional effects on student outcomes, [lack of emphasis on managing teaching and learning] can no longer be defended" (p. 30).

Postulate 4. **Professional socialization into educational administration should occur during the inservice phase of preparation.** The insights, understandings, and knowledge derived from research and theory is what university faculty are best prepared to provide and are likely to be of most value to experienced administrators (Duke, in press). In contrast, during their first days and months on the job, principals are most concerned about relations with teachers, relations with peers and superiors, relations with the community, and learning standard building and district operating procedure (Duke, 1987), concerns for which preparation in educational administration is least useful.

Despite our understanding of the differing effects of professional and organizational socialization, virtually every critique of educational administration takes "for granted that the first phase of principal preparation would take place at the

university or in a university-sponsored program" (Duke, in press). Under the present system of preservice preparation in educational administration, "by the time administrators have occupied a position for a few years ... their preparation programs are over and their willingness to continue taking conventional graduate courses has diminished" (Duke, in press).

By placing professional socialization during inservice, the educational administration preparation program can emphasize the integration of theory with the practical experience of principals. The program should be designed to develop an awareness of what school leaders do -- including an understanding of the problems they confront; development of the knowledge, skills, and abilities they may be called upon to demonstrate; and an understanding of the types of interactions in which they engage -- and an understanding of how practice varies across settings. In addition, the professional program should include a liberal arts component to ensure that school administrators understand the purposes and effects of education within cultural, social, economic, and political contexts (Duke, 1988).

Postulate 5. **The value of performance-based licensure is its ability to target areas of preparation and practice that are linked to student learning.** We have enough insight into the ways principals influence teacher and student performance to assess the understandings and practice of candidates in this regard. Since instructional leadership is an essential function of principals in present schools, and is likely to remain so in the future, it is imperative that licensure assessments have a strong focus in this area.

Candidates for initial certification will be required to demonstrate their knowledge of teaching and learning and the application of that knowledge, and their ability to evaluate and supervise teaching. Prior to professional certification, principals will be required to document that they fostered a focus on teaching and learning that resulted in improved performance for all students. This documentation will be used to

assess the degree to which candidates facilitated the articulation of district curriculum and instruction to promote student outcomes that go beyond performance measured by standardized tests.

The viability of performance assessment for determining the competence and knowledge of teachers (Leinhardt, 1990; Pecheone & Carey, 1990; Wilson, et. al., 1989) and administrators (Hersey, 1989; Morgan & Hall, 1989; Thorton & Byham, 1982) has been demonstrated. Performance assessments can serve as a catalyst for change (Pecheone & Carey, 1990) in the preparation and practice of principals, promoting understandings, activities, and orientations that focus on the instructional leadership role of the principal.

CHARLENE JONES -- FOLLOWING THE CAREER OF A HYPOTHETICAL PRINCIPAL

To illustrate the operation of our proposed framework for preparation and licensure, we present the case of Charlene Jones. Ms. Jones' career path is presented to help the reader understand what this framework may look like in operation, not to suggest that there will be but one acceptable path to the principalship. Recall that our proposal is largely outcome-based, placing substantial emphasis on performance assessment, and diminishes the importance of counting course credits. A schemata of the proposed Connecticut licensure framework is provided in Figure 1 (page 15).

Preservice

Ms. Jones knows that her qualification for the initial certificate will be predicated on her knowledge of teaching and learning and her ability to evaluate and supervise teaching. Even though no specific course requirements exist, she enrolls in graduate courses in educational and developmental psychology because she knows the

examination will require her to apply her understandings of these areas to a school context.

Ms. Jones develops her evaluation skills by preparing to be a state assessor of beginning teachers, which includes intensive practice in conducting and documenting classroom observations, and organizing and interpreting the data from them. The training she receives does not endorse a particular method of teaching, but requires her to analyze a variety of pedagogical approaches according to indicators of effectiveness identified through research. Ms. Jones works with a colleague at her regional educational service center to develop her supervisory skills, as she applies her classroom observation techniques to help novice teachers identify areas of strengths and weakness.

Ms. Jones qualifies for her initial certificate by successfully completing an examination of her knowledge of teaching and learning and an assessment of her evaluation and supervision skills. The exam may consist of essay questions that require the application of her understanding of teaching and learning to the development of performance standards for students and to a critique of opposing viewpoints regarding teaching practice and the development of a school mission. In addition, Ms. Jones views a videotape of an experienced teacher and identifies areas of strength and weakness. Following the video, she is rated on her performance during a simulated conference with the teacher from the video.

Initial Certificate

When she secures her first job, she enters an intensive supervisory relationship with her superintendent and a clinical seminar for first-year principals at an institution of higher education. The seminar meets periodically throughout the year, and employs organizational and social/cultural analyses to examine and make sense of the induction-year experience.

Prior to receiving her provisional certificate, Ms. Jones' superintendent verifies that she has learned the expectations and performance criteria of the local district, the goals of the organization, the culture and norms of the district and community, local policies and regulations, and the skills needed by a school administrator on a day-to-day basis. In addition, the institution of higher education attests to Ms. Jones' ability to analyze her experiences and grow professionally.

Provisional Certificate

During her employment under the provisional certificate she completes a professional preparation program in educational administration and may be required to develop a portfolio demonstrating her administrative performance. Ms. Jones' portfolio documents that she fostered a school culture where adults were engaged in inquiry about teaching and learning and provides evidence of her influence of student performance. The documentation Ms. Jones presents includes her coordination of teacher evaluation and supervision, professional development, curriculum development, and program evaluation, and evidence of student performance.

Ms. Jones defends her portfolio before a panel of experienced administrators. The process requires her to justify her choice of work samples and to address the progress of the upper and lower achieving students in the school. Ms. Jones demonstrates that she has promoted a school culture that values teacher inquiry into teaching and learning.

Professional Certificate

The professional certificate is a five year, renewable license. Ms. Jones demonstrates her commitment to her own professional development by earning continuing education units to be eligible for renewal.

SUMMARY

We have proposed a framework for preparing and licensing principals that departs substantially from other initiatives. Preservice preparation will be grounded in the understanding of teaching and learning, and the application of this knowledge. As presently conceived, it is possible for a candidate to qualify for initial certification without taking formal coursework in administration. Formal preparation in the content of educational administration will occur during the first years of service.

Licensure will be grounded in the demonstration of competence rather than a review of course transcripts. Understanding of teaching and learning and the application of that understanding, and the ability to supervise teachers will be the requisite for initial certification. Successful initial service will be attested to by the employing superintendent. Professional preparation in educational administration and an assessment of the principal's first years of service, that focuses on the candidate's impact on student and school performance, will constitute the gateway to professional certification.

We believe that the Connecticut framework has the potential to change the way practitioners and academics think about the principalship. The utilization of performance assessments that focus on candidates' knowledge of and effect on teaching and learning promises to promote preparation and practice that will benefit students and schools.

NOTES

1 For purposes of this paper, we define the difference between licensure and certification as follows: Licensure refers to a process that is mandated by a governmental body in order to practice one's profession. By contrast, certification refers to a voluntary process carried out by a governmental or non-governmental professional body, such as the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1990). This paper specifically refers to a process of state mandated licensing of school principals in Connecticut. However, as the observant reader will note, a candidate who is credentialed in Connecticut receives a certificate, not a license. For a more indepth discussion of licensure in education, see Chester and Pecheone, in press.

2 The authors recognize the contributions that a number of people made to the ideas presented in this paper. In addition to members of Connecticut's Administrator Certification Task Force, who challenged the present way Connecticut prepares and licenses principals, Betty Sternberg and Abigail Hughes of the Connecticut State Department of Education contributed to the development of Connecticut's proposal for licensure reform. While many of the ideas discussed herein were crafted with the input of these individuals, the authors alone are responsible for the content of this paper.

3 Some states have initiated revisions to principal preparation, licensure, and selection requirements which have been incompletely implemented. New Jersey law calls for a performance assessment licensure requirement which has not been operationalized due to lack of funding. New Jersey has implemented an alternate route to licensure that by-passes traditional educational administration preparation. The Virginia Department of Education issued guidelines for the reform of principal preparation programs that are to be implemented by July 1, 1992. For reasons that Duke (in press) discusses, the reform guidelines are likely to be only partially met.

Missouri has instituted the most substantial licensure changes of which we are aware. Prior to being licensed, candidates for principal and superintendent licenses must successfully complete an assessment that includes a knowledge examination and performance simulation exercises. South Carolina requires principal candidates to participate in the National Association of Secondary School Principals Assessment Center. The results of the assessment are not directly linked to licensure, but districts are required to consider them before selecting a principal.

4 For example, Connecticut, Georgia, and Louisiana have incorporated classroom observation assessments in their licensure programs, while California, New York, and South Carolina are currently considering their use. In addition, California and Connecticut are developing performance simulation exercises to supplement classroom observations.

5 The NASSP Assessment Center is one component of the Missouri licensure assessment for principals. It is used for principal selection in South Carolina, and is used for professional development in a variety of settings (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985).

REFERENCES

Barth, R. S. (1986). On sheep and goats and school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*(4) 293-296.

Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18*(3), 34-64.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., Knowles, J. G., & Crow, N. A. (1989). Teacher self-concept and student culture in the first year of teaching. *Teachers College Record, 91*(2), 209-233.

Byham, W. C. (1989). Assessment centers in United States education. In J. D. Wilson, G. O. B. Thomson, R. E. Millward, and T. Keenan (Eds.), *Assessment for Teacher Development* (pp. 55-73). London: Falmer Press.

Chester, M. D., & Pecheone, R. L. (in press). Toward assessment-based licensure of school principals. *International Journal of Educational Management.*

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1990). *The principal's role in shaping school culture.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Duke, D. L. (1987). *School leadership and instructional improvement.* New York: Random House.

Duke, D. L. (1988). *Thoughts on the preparation of principals.* Paper prepared for presentation to the Danforth Foundation Principal Preparation Group.

Duke, D. L. (in press). The rhetoric and the reality of reform in educational administration. *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Forsyth, P. B. (1992). Redesigning the preparation of school administrators: Toward consensus. In S. D. Thomson (Ed.), *School leadership: A blueprint for change.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Better teachers for our nation's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(3), 185-194.

Hart, A. W. (1991). Leader succession and socialization: A synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(4), 451-474.

Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *26*(2), 94-125.

Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Examining contextual differences in the development of instructional leadership and school achievement. *The Urban Review*, *22*(4), 247-265.

Hersey, P. W. (1989). Identifying and Developing Superior Principals. In J. D. Wilson, G. O. B. Thomson, R. E. Millward, and T. Keenan (Eds.), *Assessment for Teacher Development* (pp. 153-158). London: Falmer Press.

Kennedy, M. M. (1991). Policy issues in teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *72*(9), 659-665.

Leinhardt, G. (1990). Capturing craft knowledge in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(2), 18-25.

Leithwood, K. A., & Stager, M. (1989). Expertise in principals' problem solving. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *25*(2), 126-161.

The Maryland LEAD Center. (1988). *10 skill areas for school principals*. College Park, MD: Author.

Mitchell, R. (1992). *Testing for learning*. New York: Free Press.

Morgan, C., & Hall, V. (1989). Assessment for school leadership: Selecting secondary headteachers in England and Wales. In J. D. Wilson, G. O. B. Thomson, R. E. Millward, and T. Keenan (Eds.), *Assessment for Teacher Development* (pp. 153-158). London: Falmer Press.

Murphy, J. (1989). Principal instructional leadership. In P. Thurston and L. Lotto (Eds.), *Advances in educational leadership*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1989). A new era in the professional development of school administrators: Lessons from emerging programmes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *27*(2), 22-45.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1985). *Performance-based preparation of principals: A framework for improvement*. Reston, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1986). Skills to be assessed. *NASSP Bulletin*, *70*(486), 10.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1990). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession: Initial policies and perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2nd edition*. Detroit: Author.

National Commission for the Principalship. (1990). *Principals for Our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification.* Fairfax, VA: Author.

National Governors' Association. (1990). *Educating America: State strategies for achieving the national education goals.* Washington, DC: Author.

National LEADership Network Study Group on Restructuring Schools. (1991). *Developing leaders for restructuring schools: New habits of mind and heart.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform.* Charlottesville, VA: Author.

Pecheone, R. L., & Carey, N. B. (1990). The validity of performance assessments for teacher licensure: Connecticut's ongoing research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 3,* 115-142.

Peters, S. (1988). *State-mandated principal evaluation: A report on current practice.* Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Teddlie, C., Kirby, P. C., & Stringfield, S. (1989). Effective versus ineffective schools: Observable differences in the classroom. *American Journal of Education, 97*(3), 221-236.

Texas LEAD Center. (1988). *School administrator job performance statements.* Austin, TX: Texas Association of School Administrators.

Thorton III, G. C., & Byham, W. C. (1982). *Assessment centers and managerial performance.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Viglio, I., Teddlie, C., & Oescher, J. (1991). Variance and context differences in teaching at differentially effective schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 2*(2) 152-168.

Wilson, J. D., Thomson, G. O. B., Millward, R. E., & Keenan, T. (1989). *Assessment for Teacher Development.* London: Falmer Press.